



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,822	10/23/2003	Leonardo E. Blanco	13768.783.185	1433
47973 7590 05/18/2007 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER HAJNIK, DANIEL F	
			ART UNIT 2628	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/693,822

Applicant(s)

BLANCO ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel F. Hajnik

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 3, event is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-9, 16, 18-30, 32, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson (NPL Document "Animation Support in a User Interface Toolkit: Flexible, Robust, and Reusable Abstractions") in view of Grinstein et al. (US Patent 6,714,201) in further view of Hoddie et al. (US Patent 5,727,141).

As per claim 1, Hudson teaches the claimed "a first component" by teaching of the toolkit for creating high level events (1st full paragraph in 2nd col on page 6).

Hudson teaches the claimed "wherein the first component comprises an event list generator" by teaching of an event list in figure 5 on page 8. In this figure, the event list is a series of animations or multimedia sequences.

Hudson teaches the claimed "the events being generated by the event list generator" by teaching of "It receives an input event, then translates and dispatches that event to one or more interactor objects in the form of messages. These interactor objects then respond to the (high-

Art Unit: 2628

level) messages” (2nd full paragraph in 1st col on page 8). Hudson further teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “As transitions are scheduled, those have determined starting and ending times are placed in a scheduling queue” (bottom paragraph in 1st col on page 8).

Hudson teaches the claimed: “second component that receives the interval data from the first component and determines an output based on the interval data and current time data, such that timing of the output is relative to both the interval data and the current time data” by teaching of “‘low-level’ systems that provide more direct access to the machine are employed” (1st paragraph under section 4) by teaching of: “If an object is to move from point to point B in 3 seconds, the interface implementor can easily state this. In addition, the system will deliver a metered set of animation steps to the object which cause it to arrive at point B as close to 3 seconds after leaving point A as possible, with as smooth a transition as the actual OS and window system performance and timing allow” (2nd paragraph in 2nd col on page 3). In this instance, the current time data is used to determine 3 seconds and the interval data number of frames of animation that can be drawn in 3 seconds. Hudson further teaches this claimed limitation by teaching of “The goal of the system then, is to deliver animation steps with parameters that match the actually occurring intervals of time as closely as possible” (output determined based upon animation steps of intervals)(3rd full paragraph in 1st col on page 8).

Hudson specifically teaches the claimed “such that timing of the output is relative to both the interval data and the current time data” by teaching of “The system currently measures the real-time response of the drawing portion of the redraw cycle. The current time is recorded just before the interactor tree is traversed to produce drawing updates” (1st paragraph under section 5). In this instance, the timing of the output is based upon the real time response of the drawing

Art Unit: 2628

(output is relative to interval data). Hudson teaches of the output being relative to the current time data by teaching of “the system will deliver a metered set of animation steps to the object which cause it to arrive at point B as close to 3 seconds after leaving point A as possible, with as smooth a transition as the actual OS and window system performance and timing allow” (2nd paragraph in 2nd col on page 3)”. In this instance, the fact that the object arrives at point B as close to 3 seconds as possible means that the output (the animation of the object) is relative to the current time data (3 seconds).

Hudson does not explicitly teach the remaining claim limitations.

Grinstein teaches the claimed:

Receives a clock data and graphics data from a program through an API (*col 17, lines 32-35, “The OpenMotion API internally maintains a simulation clock. This clock can be configured by the programmer as a real-time clock” and col 17, lines 13-19, “Many graphics programs ... interface with other programs through callbacks ... With programs which use a callback architecture, OpenMotion API can be integrated”*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hudson with Grinstein in order to achieve better communication between programs and in order to utilize useful pre-built functions in the API.

Hoddie teaches the claimed:

“an interval generator” and

“wherein the interval generator of the first component computes interval data based on the clock data, and wherein the interval data corresponds to a relative determination of time between a first event and a second event” (col 6, lines 13-17, *“Each cycle of the clock represents a predetermined time interval for a time-based media sequence. However, cycles of the clock can be tied to different events (e.g., for a time-independent movie) rather than specific time intervals” where an interval can be defined in terms a first event and a second event because the clock which the intervals are based can be tied to different events*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hudson, Grinstein, and Hoddie in order to handle media sequences which are time-independent movies where the interval is based upon the movie and its associated events (col 6, lines 15-17).

As per claim 2, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of in figure 6, which shows the progress of an animation.

As per claim 3, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation, but does suggest it by teaching of "as well as complete support for keyframe (pose-to-pose) interpolation for future work" (bottom paragraph in 1st col on page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hudson to perform the claimed limitation in order to better handle interpolation between keyframes (bottom paragraph in 1st col on page 3).

As per claim 4, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of "'low-level' systems that provide more direct access to the machine are employed" (second component)(1st paragraph under section 4) which is faster than the toolkit program (first component) which provides high level events (1st full paragraph in 2nd col on page 6) for scheduling animation to the system from time to time according to user input. Thus, the second component which does the actual drawing and system updating operates at a faster operation rate.

As per claim 5, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Hoddie teaches the claimed limitation (col 6, lines 13-17, "***Each cycle of the clock represents a predetermined time interval for a time-based media sequence. However, cycles of the clock can be tied to different events (e.g., for a time-independent movie) rather than specific time intervals" where these events can originate and be organized by way of an event list***). It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2628

to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 1 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 6, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of scheduling events based upon the user interface (see top of 2nd col on page 5) and by teaching of “animation in an interface” (middle paragraph in 2nd col on page 1).

As per claim 7, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “(these transitions in turn schedule themselves and may possibly be place in the selected set and started)” (middle paragraph in 2nd col on page 8). In this instance, these events are implicit because they schedule themselves rather than the user directly scheduling them.

As per claim 8, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of idle events where nothing happens (unused events) (bottom paragraph in 2nd col on page 7).

As per claim 9, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “The final four parameters to the transition establish its time interval. This transition is set to operate over a time interval beginning in 500 milliseconds and lasting for 4 seconds” (middle of 1st col on page 7). In this instance, the output is determined based upon the current time (beginning in 500 milliseconds) and the duration (lasting 4 seconds).

As per claim 16, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “The current time is recorded just before the interactor tree is traversed to produce drawing updates” (top paragraph in 2nd col on page 9) where the current time is function data because it is used by the recording function to record the current time.

As per claim 18, the reasons and rationale for the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. Hudson does not specifically teach the claimed “providing the output to a second component which provides data to a graphics subsystem for display”. Grinstein teaches the claimed limitation (*col 16, lines 41-44, “In other situations a graphic API or game engine supplies the update loop, and the application supplies a callback function. OpenMotion API is compatible with both cases” and col 17, lines 7-10, “the application would then ask the API for the spatial attributes ... in the display list ... and then call the renderer 106”*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson in order to achieve faster rendering rates and save on implementation coding for specific display procedures by using the API to interface with the graphics subsystem.

As per claim 19, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of determining an interval based on the start and end times, and determining a progress value through modifying the animation within the interval (bottom paragraph in 2nd col on page 6). Hudson further teaches the claimed limitation in figure 6 which shows animation progress within an interval and

Art Unit: 2628

by teaching of “parameter values that uniformly track the passage of time” (bottom paragraph in 2nd col on page 5).

As per claim 20, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation in figure 6 where the animation property values (i.e. object position) varies based on the progress value.

As per claim 21, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “As transitions are scheduled, those have determined starting and ending times are placed in a scheduling queue” (bottom paragraph in 1st col on page 8) and by showing an event list in figure 5. Hudson further teaches the claimed limitations by teaching of “Each transition acts on animation or end steps as illustrated in Figure 6 ... These two values define the interval in local parameter space” (bottom paragraph in 2nd col on page 8).

As per claim 22, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of scheduling events based upon the user interface (see top of 2nd col on page 5) where the scheduling will add the events to the schedule queue in figure 6 (event list). Hudson further teaches the claimed limitations by teaching of “animation in an interface” (middle paragraph in 2nd col on page 1).

As per claim 23, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “(these transitions in turn schedule themselves and may possibly be place in the selected set and started)” (middle paragraph in 2nd col on page 8). In this instance, these events are implicit because they schedule

Art Unit: 2628

themselves rather than the user directly scheduling them. Further, these implicit events can be triggered in response to interactive events (also see top of 2nd col on page 5).

As per claim 24, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of adding an ideal event (an unused event) after a real-time drawing operation (top paragraph in 2nd col on page 9) where this drawing operation can be in response to an interactive event (also see top of 2nd col on page 5).

As per claim 25, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation, but does suggest it by teaching of “In this framework we can think of animation steps as covering adjacent intervals of time roughly corresponding to redraw cycles” (middle paragraph in 1st col on page 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hudson to perform the claimed limitation in order to base the redraw cycles on the refresh rate in order to produce a clear and smooth animation.

As per claim 26, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of basing the system off of program code (see top paragraph in 1st col on page 7 and code in 1st col on page 7). It is inherent for a computer-readable storage medium to be used in order for the system to function correctly as described by Hudson.

As per claim 27, the reasons and rationale for the rejection of claims 1 and 18 are incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 2628

Hudson teaches the claimed “the first component receiving clock data” (*1st paragraph under section 5, “The current time is recorded”*).

Hudson teaches the claimed “the first component passing to the second component an interval list” (*towards lower middle portion of 1st col on page 8, “The goal of the system then, is to deliver animation steps with parameters that match the actually occurring intervals of time as closely as possible” and 1st paragraph under section 4 on page 7, “‘low level’ systems that provide more direct access to the machine” where these direct access graphics support functions are draw the animation data based on intervals and where more than one animation can form an interval list*).

Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed “interpolating intervals to obtain instantaneous data”, but does suggest it by teaching of “as well as complete support for keyframe (pose-to-pose) interpolation for future work” (bottom paragraph in 1st col on page 3) and by teaching of “measures the real-time response of the drawing portion of the redraw cycle” (top of 2nd col on page 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hudson. The motivation of claim 3 is incorporated herein.

Hudson does not explicitly teach the claim limitations related to the claimed API, the claimed generating timing interval data, and the claimed interfacing with a graphics subsystem.

Grinstein teaches the claimed “API for receiving graphics data and for receiving clock data” and the claimed “receiving graphics data from a program through an API” (*col 17, lines 32-35, “The*

OpenMotion API internally maintains a simulation clock. This clock can be configured by the programmer as a real-time clock” and col 17, lines 13-19, “Many graphics programs ... interface with other programs through callbacks ... With programs which use a callback architecture, OpenMotion API can be integrated”).

Grinstein teaches the claimed “further being enabled to interface with a graphics subsystem” and the claimed “the second component providing graphics data to a graphics subsystem for display” (col 16, lines 41-44, “In other situations a graphic API or game engine supplies the update loop, and the application supplies a callback function. OpenMotion API is compatible with both cases” and col 17, lines 7-10, “the application would then ask the API for the spatial attributes ... in the display list ... and then call the renderer 106”. In this instance, the graphics subsystem is interfaced with the API to render quickly to the display).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed features of Grinstein with Hudson. The motivation of claims 1 and 18 are both incorporated herein.

Hoddie teaches the claimed “the first component generating timing interval data based at least in part on the event list” (col 6, lines 13-17, “Each cycle of the clock represents a predetermined time interval for a time-based media sequence. However, cycles of the clock can be tied to different events (e.g., for a time-independent movie) rather than specific time intervals” where an interval can be defined in terms a first event and a second event).

Art Unit: 2628.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed features of Hoddie with Hudson. The motivation of claim 1 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 28, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations.

Grinstein teaches the claimed “computer processors capable of executing the instructions encoded upon the computer-readable medium” (*col 4, lines 17-21, “establishing separation from application code, incorporating multi -processing with specific event handling and callbacks to applications” where multi-processing can be accomplished with processors*).

Grinstein teaches the claimed “a graphics subsystem to display graphics based upon the graphics data provided by the second component” (*col 17, lines 7-10, “the application would then ask the API for the spatial attributes ... in the display list ... and then call the renderer 106”. In this instance, the graphics subsystem is interfaced to display application graphics data*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed features of Grinstein with Hudson in order to take advantage of an efficient and effective way to process computer related data. Also, the motivation of claim 18 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 29, the reasons and rationale for the rejection of claims 1 and 18 are incorporated herein.

As per claim 30, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of generating intervals based upon absolute times (bottom paragraph in 1st col on page 6) where the absolute

Art Unit: 2628

times are based upon the clock. Hudson teaches of receiving the current time from the clock (a clock property)(top paragraph in 2nd col on page 9).

As per claim 32, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “schedules the transition only once its full interval is resolved” (a transition of events)(top paragraph in 2nd col on page 6) and by teaching of “(these transitions in turn schedule themselves and may possibly be place in the selected set and started)” (middle paragraph in 2nd col on page 8). In this instance, these inserted events are implicit because they schedule themselves rather than the user directly scheduling them.

As per claim 35, Hudson teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of idle events (unused events) where these events do not change the state of operation (bottom paragraph in 2nd col on page 7).

As per claim 36, this claim is similar in scope to claim 26, and thus is rejected under the same rationale.

1. Claims 10-15, 17, 28, 31, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson in view of Grinstein in further view of Hoddie in further view of Milne (US Patent 5553222, herein referred to as “Milne”).

As per claim 10, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches the claimed limitation in figure 5 where clock A is shown to have a repeat count of 2 where the

Art Unit: 2628

repeat count indicates that clock B ticks at least twice as often as clock A. For example, clock A waits for clock B to be repeated twice before adding a unit of time to its count. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Hudson, Grinstein, Hoddie, and Milne. One advantage to the combination is that Milne teaches of improved clock control which provide a variety of operations to control the playback for synchronization or for user preference.

As per claim 11, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches the claimed limitations by stating "Clocks can travel backwards in time" (col 7, lines 28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

As per claims 12 and 13, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches the claimed limitations by teaching of basing a moving playback position (which is the equivalent of a play head on a tape recorder) according to a clock rate (col 9, lines 12-16). Milne teaches of slowing down and speeding up a clock such as a master clock (col 9, lines 30-33) where this slowing down and speeding up would have to have an associated de-acceleration or acceleration. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 14, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of "A non-driven time source knows how to find its current time, and it has a member function, `GetNextTime()`, that returns the next time that an alarm or

Art Unit: 2628

delay should be fired" (col 12, lines 57-60) where this process of finding the next time an alarm or delay should be fired is a seek instruction because it is seeking out the next time an associated event should fire. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 15, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of a clock rate (speed data) by stating "a is a floating point value that determines the rate of the slave clock's current time relative to the master clock's current time)" (col 8, lines 25-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 17, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of associating different clocks (and thus their associated players which are components) with a unique thread by teaching of blocking/unblocking threads. Milne states "A clock can block a thread until a certain time, called the delay time, is reached. If the clock is going forward, the thread is unblocked when the clock's current time is equal to or greater than the delay time" (col 7, lines 35-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 31, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches of a dependent clock receiving properties from another clock (i.e. an independent clock) in figure

Art Unit: 2628

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 33, Hudson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation. Milne teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of “start & stop: A clock can be stopped, in which case its current time does not change, regardless of whether or not its master is changing. A stopped clock can be restarted, which causes the clock to continue to follow its master” (col 8, lines 50-54). In this instance, the pausing or stopping the clock suspends the current state of the clock and creates a stop event. According to the reference, when the animation is played again, the state will go from inactive to active through a process of restarting the clock. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

As per claim 34, the reasons and rationale for the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated herein in regards to the claimed “inserting an implicit event” because claim 32 claims a similar feature.

Hudson does not explicitly the claimed “iteration”. Milne teaches the claimed limitation in figure 5 where clock A is shown to have a repeat count (an iteration) of 2 where the repeat count indicates that clock B ticks at least twice as often as clock A. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed feature with Hudson. The motivation of claim 10 is incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/16/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hudson does not teach the claimed second component and that the teaching relied upon in Hudson is merely a hypothetical conjecture (top and middle page 13 in filed response). The examiner respectfully maintains that the rejections are proper because Hudson teaches the advantage and reasons why such a low level system that would provide direct access to the machine would be desirable. In particular, under the first paragraph under section 4 on page 7, Hudson states that the low level systems would provide faster and better performance for real-time animation. Thus, the reference would give motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a second component that provides faster and more direct animation support by having direct access to the machine. Further, Hudson teaches in a second instance of using the second component on page 8, towards the middle of the 2nd col by teaching of using low-level idle events that form the protocol for the animation abstraction. In this instance, the low-level component is associated with the operating system and the redraw cycle. Thus, Hudson does teach the claimed second component.

Applicant's remaining arguments with respect to the claims have also been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel F. Hajnik whose telephone number is (571) 272-7642. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30A-5:00P).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka J. Chauhan can be reached on (571) 272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. 95. 5/11/07

DFH


Ulka Chauhan

Supervisory Patent Examiner